

corded by Frauenfeld as bred from *Inula viscosa* was not Loew's species of that name and was described as *M. limbardae* by Schiner. The references in Kertesz's Catalogue under *M. longirostris* to Schiner and Kaltenbach also relate to *M. limbardae* because they both refer to Frauenfeld's breeding record. Mr Niblett has established the fact that our species from *Inula crithmoides* is not *M. longirostris*, Lw., and it is most improbable that Loew's species will ever be found in this country.

*M. frauenfeldi*, Schin. (1864), and *M. eximia*, Seguy (1932).—It is certainly incorrect to sink *M. frauenfeldi*, Schin., as a synonym of *M. longirostris*, Lw. One has only to compare the descriptions given by Schiner for *frauenfeldi* and by Frauenfeld for the " ? *blotii* " which Schiner subsequently named *frauenfeldi*, with Loew's description of *longirostris*, to realise that they could not apply to the same species. *M. longirostris* is a more extensively yellow species, while *M. frauenfeldi* was described as having the very same darker colour characters used by Seguy for distinguishing his species *eximia*. So far as one can be certain without comparing types, our species from *Inula crithmoides*, Seguy's *eximia*, and Schiner's *frauenfeldi* (both bred also from this food-plant), are all the same species, which must be known as *M. frauenfeldi*, Schiner, the name under which I added it to the British List in 1910 (*Ent. Month. Mag.*, xlv, 174). The breeding of this species from *Inula crithmoides* in Britain was first recorded by Walker in 1871 (*Entomologist*, v, p. 450) under the name of *T. signata* Mg. (v. Fitch in *Entomologist*, xv, 1882, p. 138). Fitch called the species *M. inulae*, v. Ros., failing to recognise it as *M. frauenfeldi*, probably because Schiner included this latter species under his couplet "Flügelrandmal gelb," whereas the species really has the stigma yellowish about the base and darkened towards tip.

I have bred both of our British species in very large numbers and there is considerable variation in both species in wing markings and, to a certain extent, in colour; for instance, in *frauenfeldi* the legs, usually yellow, may be extensively tawny-brown, and the dark markings on abdominal tergites may be restricted to a pair of large isolated spots on each tergite, always larger than in *blotii*, and never approaching the very restricted (or even absent) markings of *longirostris*; in any case, the palest *frauenfeldi* can always be separated from the darkest *blotii* by the shape of the head, while the stigma of wings is always more extensively darkened in the latter than in the former.

---

### THE MISUSE OF THE HOMONYM RULE.

---

Our colleague, Rev. Geo. Wheeler, has called attention to the absolutely unnecessary suggested replacement of the Erebiid name *arete* in that splendid book on the genus *Erebia* issued by the Trustees of the British Museum (Nat. Hist.). I have looked closely into this in connection with the Homonym Rule. This rule was formulated to obviate the redundant use of the same specific name in any circumstances where confusion as to the particular species might arise with another species labelled with the same name. The only control as to its use in every case should be "confusion" and nothing else.

Now, how do we stand about the name *arete*. In 1764, at a period when specific names were given to all forms as they superficially appeared to differ from previously named forms (species), Müller, in *Faun. Ins. Fridrichsdalina*, p. 36, described a butterfly form new to him, "Alis dentatis utrinque cinereo-fuscis: primoribus duobus, posticis quinque punctis albis," to which he applied the name *Nymphalis arete*. On p. 33 of the same work Müller had included *hyperantus*, L., as a *Danaus* species. [Actually, as was the custom, Müller wrote *Papilis Nymphalis arete* which was in fact simply saying the butterfly *Nymphalis arete*.]

Twelve years later Müller revised his previous work and in *Zool. Dan. Prod.*, p. 114 (1776), gave a list of nine varieties to the species *hyperantus*, including his own *arete*. Thus he had become convinced of his own error in at first considering *arete* as a good species.

The descriptions of these nine varieties of *hyperantus* were repeated in the *Beitr.* of Göze, Vol. III (1), 197 (1779), and also by Esper, *Abbild.*, I (2), 38 (1780?), and the latter figured 3 of these forms including *arete* (plt. 57, figs. 2, 3, 4). We thus see that the name *arete* had been applied to what was really a pure aberration (not even a subspecies) of a previously described species. In this circumstance Fabricius was quite in order in describing his (Erebiid) species under the name *arete*, in the *Mantissa*, II, 42 (1787).

Borkhausen, *Naturg.*, II, 204 (1789), in his eagerness to name another species, renamed this *arete* of the *Mantissa*, stating "Herr Fabricius named this species *arete*: I have named it *claudina*, because my Herr fellow-worker in his systematic descriptions of European (butterflies) Lepidoptera has dealt with a supposed variety of *hyperantus* under the name *arete* as a true species and I think he is right." This in spite of all the information Borkhausen could have obtained. No one followed him in this.

There is no reason whatever for the substitution of *claudina* for the long-used *arete*. The name *arete* had been used for a form of insect which was shown to be only an aberration of a previously well-known species, and was recognised as an aberration by its sponsor twelve years later. No confusion of the application of this name ever existed until this unwarrantable substitution.—HY. J. T.

[In view of the full descriptions of these nine forms of *hyperantus* given by the above three authors it is strange that Fabricius in his *Ent. Syst. emend.*, III (1), 216 (1793), six years later omits all reference to Müller, Göze and Esper, although he gives reference to no less than eleven other works.]

---

#### COLLECTING NOTES.

---

*PTILOPHORA PLUMIGERA*, ESP., IN BOURNEMOUTH.—A male specimen of this very local species came to light on the night of 10th November 1938 in the centre of Bournemouth. Maple is almost absent in the district, but sycamore is common.—S. C. BROWN.

*NEPTICULA AURELLA*, STAINI., IN FEBRUARY.—On the morning of 9th February 1939, a warm sunny day, I noticed a specimen of this species sunning itself on a leaf in a hedgerow in Kinson, Dorset.—S. C. BROWN.